Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTC/SB/33 (07-65)
Approved for use through xxfxx/200x OMS 0651-001x
kJ Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to re-		Docket Number	er (Optional)	
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REV		JP92000018	184US1/3340P	
hereby cartify that this correspondence is being deposited with the inited States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail ran envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner (San States). P. O. 80x 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	Application 09/938,2		Filed August 23, 2001	
March 28, 2005	First Name	ed inventor		
	Selichi K	AWANO		
Signature	Art Unit		Examiner	
yped or printed Enn. C. Ming	2821		Jimmy T. VU	
rith this request.				
his request is being filed with a notice of appeal.				
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a	ittached shee	et(s).		
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provi-	ittached shee ded.	et(s).		
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a	ittached shed		and the state of t	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provi	ittached shec ded.			
the review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provi	ittached sheedded.		Alexander and a second a second and a second a second and	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provious the second of the entire interest.	ded.		Signature	
the review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provi	ded.		Alexander and a second a second and a second a second and	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provious am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3 71. Statement under 37 CFR 3 73(b) is enclosed (Form FTC/SB/96)		אַעד	Signature Erin C Ming	
the review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provious am the applicant/reventor. applicant/reventor.		Tyr	Signature Erin C Ming sed or printed name	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provious am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3 71. Statement under 37 CFR 3 73(b) is enclosed (Form FTC/SB/96)		Typ	Signature Erin C. Ming eed or printed name 650) 493-4540	
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the a Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provium to the second of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 27, Saturburent under 37 CFR 3 73(b) is enclosed (Form FT0.5686s) aboves or agent of record 47,797 Registration number.		Typ	Signature Efin C. Ming ed or printed name 650) 493-4540 elephone number	

This collection of Information is required by 38 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to retain to benefit by the quate rinth in to 16 kg (not light the USEPTO to process) an application. Comitive finitely as governed by 25 U.S.C. 122 of 100 to 100 to

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to Examiner Jimmy T. Vu at via the DSPTO EPS-Web on March 28, 2006.

Brin Ming

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Date: March 28, 2006

Seiichi KAWANO Confirmation No. 1698

Serial No: 09/938,221 Group Art Unit: 2821

Filed: August 23, 2001 Examiner: Jimmy T. VU

For: BRIGHTNESS CONTROLLING APPARATUS, BRIGHTNESS ADJUSTING SYSTEM, COMPUTER SYSTEM, LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY UNIT, BRIGHTNESS CONTROLLING METHOD, COMPUTER SOFTWARE, AND

STORAGE MEDIUM

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir or Madam:

In the present application, claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,760,760 to Helms. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper since Helms clearly fails to disclose the elements recited in claim 1 and as such, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established.

Claim I recites "an evaluator for detecting a feature of a certain window displayed on a screen of a display unit." Element 14 in Helms has been cited as disclosing the "evaluator" recited in claim 1.

Helms, however, only states that the "photodetector or light sensor 14 . . . [is] for detecting a level of ambient light directed toward the front of the LCD 12 and for generating signals indicative of same" (col. 3, lns. 17-21) (emphasis added). Thus, element 14 in Helms is not "for detecting a feature of a certain window displayed on a screen of a display unit," and as such, cannot be construed as disclosing the "evaluator" recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Further, as clearly shown in Figures 1 and 4 of Helms, photodetector/light sensor 14 cannot possibly detect anything displayed on a screen since it is illustrated as being above LCD 12 and pointing away from the front of LCD 12, not towards it. Therefore, element 14 cannot be "an evaluator for detecting a feature of a certain window displayed on a screen of a display unit," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the goal of Helms is to "automatically [adjust] the brightness level of an LCD based on the ambient lighting conditions of the environment in which the LCD is being operated" (col. 2, Ins. 6-9) (emphasis added). Whereas, claim 1 recites "a display controller for controlling the brightness of said screen of said display unit according to said feature of said window, detected by said evaluator" (emphasis added). Hence, while Helms is directed towards adjusting screen brightness based on lighting conditions external to the screen, claim 1 is directed towards adjusting screen brightness based on what is displayed on the screen.

Attorney Docket: JP920000184US1/3340P

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Helms clearly fails to disclose the

elements recited in claim 1 and as such, the rejection is improper since a prima facie case of

anticipation has not been established.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is

believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: March 28, 2006

Erin C. Ming

Attorney for Applicant(s) Reg. No. 47,797

(650) 475-1449

-3-